

**ENTERED**

April 07, 2025

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION**

DONNA R. ELLIS,	§	CIVIL ACTION No
Plaintiff,	§	4:23-cv-03691
	§	
	§	
vs.	§	JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE
	§	
	§	
LELAND DUDEK,	§	
ACTING	§	
COMMISSIONER OF	§	
SOCIAL SECURITY,	§	
Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING  
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff Donna Renee Ellis filed a complaint for Social Security Disability Benefits against Defendant on October 2, 2023. Dkt 1. The matter was referred for disposition to Magistrate Judge Christina A. Bryan. Dkt 15.

Pending is a Memorandum and Recommendation by Magistrate Judge Christina A. Bryan dated February 14, 2025. Dkt 17. She recommends that the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment be denied, Defendant's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment be granted, and the Commissioner's Decision affirmed.

The district court reviews *de novo* those conclusions of a magistrate judge to which a party has specifically objected. See FRCP 72(b)(3) & 28 USC § 636(b)(1)(C); see also *United States v Wilson*, 864 F2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir 1989, *per curiam*). The district court may accept any other portions to which there's no objection if satisfied that no clear error appears on the face of the record. See *Guillory v PPG Industries Inc*, 434 F3d 303, 308 (5th Cir 2005), citing *Douglass v United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F3d

1415, 1430 (5th Cir 1996, *en banc*); see also FRCP 72(b) advisory committee note (1983).

None of the parties filed objections. No clear error otherwise appears upon review and consideration of the Memorandum and Recommendation, the record, and the applicable law.


The Memorandum and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is ADOPTED as the Memorandum and Order of this Court. Dkt 17.

This case is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

This is a FINAL JUDGMENT.

SO ORDERED.

Signed on April 04, 2025, at Houston, Texas.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Charles Eskridge  
United States District Judge